

# DRAFT

## 2004 Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

### Specificity and Focus of Strategies

### Fit of Project Lists

This report contains draft results of the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) Review Panel's evaluations of the focus and specificity of strategies developed by lead entities and the fit of project lists to those strategies, as described in the SRFB 5<sup>th</sup> Round Policies and Project Selection Manual 18.

The Review Panel's ratings and narratives for each lead entity are contained in the evaluation forms that comprise the body of this report. In addition, a snapshot of ratings for all lead entities is provided in the Review Panel Rating Summary Chart.

### Process

#### **Strategy Evaluations (March-April 2004)**

The Review Panel met with all 26 lead entities from March 22 to April 13 to discuss strategies and provide early opportunities for interaction.

#### **Project List Evaluations (July-October 2004)**

After the July 16 application deadline, the Review Panel reviewed written materials submitted by lead entities including: strategy summaries, strategies, responses by lead entities to questions about strategies and project lists, and other project materials.

From September 21 to October 7, the Review Panel and technical advisors met as a group with lead entities to seek additional information and clarifications. At these meetings, lead entities made presentations about their strategies, strategy summaries, rationale for how project lists fit with the strategies, and projects of concern.

Specific criteria for Review Panel evaluations are in Appendix D of Manual 18 (attached). It is important to note that for the 5<sup>th</sup> round, the SRFB directed the review panel not to evaluate the overall quality of lead entity strategies but to instead evaluate the focus and specificity of strategies.

### Methods

The Review Panel's evaluation of **specificity and focus** addressed four categories: species, habitat features and watershed processes, actions and geographic areas, and community issues, based on the *Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*. For each of these categories the Review Panel provided a rating of *excellent*, *good*, *fair*, or *poor*, and the rationale for the rating.

The Review Panel's evaluation of how well each lead entity's **project list** reflected priorities in their strategies addressed two categories: habitat restoration and protection actions and geographic areas, and the fit of project ranking on lists. For each category, the Review Panel provided a rating of *excellent*, *good*, *fair*, or *poor*, and the rationale for the rating. Finally, a general summary is provided in narrative form for each lead entity.

To make rating determinations, the Review Panel applied the definitions of "excellent" from Appendix D of Manual 18, associated with each of the six rating categories. Given the upper bound established by the definitions of excellent, the ratings for the other three categories (good, fair, and poor) were determined by judging how well the projects addressed the questions the Review Panel considered in each category (as posed in Appendix D of Manual 18).

It was of utmost importance to the Review Panel that its ratings and narratives be as accurate and fair as possible based on the information reviewed. Striving for consistency within and between categories was crucial. In developing its draft ratings and narratives, the Review Panel deliberated and rigorously evaluated each question in detail, and involved technical advisors and SRFB staff for assistance as needed.

### Interpretive Notes

- Based on experience with the process, the Review Panel urges caution in interpreting the ratings outside the context of the narratives. The definitions of "excellent" typically set challenging standards that were difficult to achieve in most cases. It is important to note however, that with only four categories to work with, a considerable range of variation exists within each. The narratives will help clarify the variability within ratings.
- The "excellent" standard, while very high, does not mean that there is no room for improvement. For example, all lead entities have room to improve their identification, prioritization, and linkages to habitat features associated with watershed processes that are essential for long-term salmon recovery and conservation.
- The ratings for specificity and focus of strategies formed the basis for determining how well project lists fit strategies. When strategies were not specific or focused in one or more respects, ratings in the "fit-to-list" categories were affected, particularly with respect to rank order. In those cases, the Review Panel rated rank order typically as "excellent" because a wide variety of projects were very consistent with the vague strategy.

In contrast, for specific and well-focused strategies rank order determinations were likely to be meaningful. In addition, the Review Panel feels ratings of rank order will be most useful in instances where lists contain multiple projects (some lists had very few projects), and where projects on lists clearly fell well outside the rank order that would otherwise have been expected with a vague strategy. The Review Panel

does not feel statewide consistency was achieved for rank order ratings. To reiterate, narratives associated with rank order will convey information more consistently and more meaningfully than ratings.

For these reasons, the Review Panel concluded its ratings of rank order will be of dubious value and subject to likely misinterpretation, and recommends that the SRFB consider eliminating those ratings from the evaluation process.

A list of the six Review Panel members and a brief resume on each member are below.

## 5<sup>th</sup> Round Review Panel

- **Jeanette Smith**, consultant, Seattle. She has served on the SRFB's technical panel in rounds 3 and 4 and has expertise in aquatic ecology. She has a master's degree in fisheries sciences from the University of Washington and a bachelor's degree with double major in biological sciences and environmental conservation from the University of Colorado.
- **Tom Robinson**, consultant, Olympia, former regional manager for the Department of Natural Resources. He holds a bachelor's degree in forest engineering from Oregon State University. He has expertise in the conservation of Endangered Species Act listed species, forest practices regulations, natural heritage, recreation, and natural resources conservation areas.
- **Karl Denison**, U.S. Forest Service, Olympic National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Olympia. He is the forest service liaison for Washington's national forests where he provides technical advice on policy issues to the regional forester, directors, and forest supervisors. He received his bachelor's degree in forest management with a minor in wildlife biology from Washington State University and is a certified silviculturist from the graduate schools at the University of Washington and Oregon State University.
- **Will Hall**, Golder Associates, Inc., Seattle. He has expertise in nearshore and watershed planning and salmon recovery and is the former Snohomish County lead entity coordinator. He has a master's degree in marine affairs from the University of Washington, a master's of arts in mathematics from the Johns Hopkins University, and a bachelor's degree in physics from the University of Chicago.
- **Bruce Smith**, consultant, Spokane. He is retired from Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife where he was the Spokane regional director with expertise in stakeholder involvement, habitat protection, wildlife management, and land use regulations. He has a bachelor's degree in biology from the University of Puget Sound.

### TEAM LEADER:

**Steve Leider**, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office, Olympia. He is a science and policy specialist with expertise in the natural production, life history, ecology, and genetics of salmon, steelhead, and trout, and the ecological and genetic interactions between hatchery and wild fish. He has a bachelor's degree in fisheries science from the University of Washington and is a certified fisheries scientist.